

Control Number: 50788



Item Number: 122

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-20-4071.WS PUC DOCKET NO. 50788

RATEPAYERS APPEAL	L OF T	THE §	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
DECISION BY WINDER	MERE OA	AKS §	
WATER SUPPLY CORPO	DRATION	TO §	OF
CHANGE WATER AND S	EWER RA	TES §	
		§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MIKE NELSON

ON BEHALF OF

WINDERMERE OAKS WATER SUPPLY CORPORATION

2021 JUN - 7 PH 4: 08

JUNE 7, 2021

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MIKE NELSON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	PURPOSE OF REBUTTAL TESTIMONY	3
III.	RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF MAXINE GILFORD	4
IV.	RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF SPENCER ENGLISH	8
V.	RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN J. MENDOZA	9
VI.	RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF PATTI FLUNKER	10
VII.	CONCLUSION	11

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment MN-6

Windermere Oaks Water Supply Corporation's 2019 Water Sewer Revenue Model

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-20-4071.WS PUC DOCKET NO. 50788

RATEPAYERS APPEAL OF THE	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
DECISION BY WINDERMERE OAKS	§	
WATER SUPPLY CORPORATION TO	§	OF
CHANGE WATER AND SEWER	Š	
RATES	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MIKE NELSON

1		I. INTRODUCTION
2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
3	A.	My name is Mike Nelson. I serve as a Board member and Treasurer for the Windermere
4		Oaks Water Supply Corporation ("WOWSC"). My business address in this capacity is 424
5		Coventry Road, Spicewood, Texas, 78669.
6	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME MIKE NELSON WHO PROVIDED DIRECT TESTIMONY
7		IN THIS CASE?
8	A.	Yes, I am.
9		II. PURPOSE OF REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
0	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS
1		PROCEEDING?
2	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to certain recommended adjustments
13		presented by the Public Utility Commission ("Commission") Staff in direct testimony.
4		Further, I respond to factual inaccuracies and general policy issues addressed in the Direct
5		Testimonies of Ratepayer Representatives of the Windermere Oaks Water Supply
6		Corporation ("Ratepayers").
7		Specifically, I respond to Staff witness Maxine Gilford's recommendations to
8		remove all outside legal costs from WOWSC's rates. I also respond to Commission Staff

- witness Stephen Mendoza's recommendations on WOWSC's base rates. Lastly, I respond
 to Ratepayer witness Patti Flunker's discussion of the rate development process.
- 3 III. RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF MAXINE GILFORD
- Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING WOWSC'S
 BASE RATES.¹
- A. Ms. Gilford recommends a total revenue requirement of \$404,855, which equates to a water revenue requirement of \$242,913 and wastewater revenue requirement of \$161,942. I will address these recommendations in my rebuttal of Commission Staff witness Stephen Mendoza, below.
- 10 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE STAFF'S PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING
 11 THE INCLUSION OF OUTSIDE LEGAL EXPENSES.²
- 12 A. Ms. Gilford recommends removing the entire \$171,337 for outside legal expenses from the 13 revenue requirement. Ms. Gilford testifies that WOWSC has failed to show that the legal 14 expenses incurred to litigate the contested matters are just and reasonable expenses that 15 may be recovered through rates. She also states that WOWSC has failed to show how these 16 expenses benefit ratepayers and that the outcome of one of the proceedings is unknown. 17 Lastly, she testifies that these expenses occurred outside of a test year and therefore should not be included in rates. WOWSC witness Joe Gimenez rebuts these arguments in his 18 19 rebuttal testimony.
- Q. DOES STAFF SUGGEST ANY ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
 INCLUSION OF THE OUTSIDE LEGAL EXPENSES?³

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY 4 MIKE NELSON

Direct Testimony of Maxine Gilford at 6:13-15 (May 5, 2021) (Gilford Direct).

² Gilford Direct at 12:8-19.

³ Gilford Direct at 16:3-7.

1 A. Yes. Ms. Gilford recognizes that the Texas Water Code ("TWC") § 13.043(j) requires that
2 the Commission use a methodology that preserves the financial integrity of the retail public
3 utility. She testifies that if WOWSC provides sufficient evidence in its rebuttal testimony
4 to demonstrate that recovery of outside legal expenses are necessary to preserve its
5 financial integrity, then she recommends that the Commission consider that information.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE IMPACT THAT DISALLOWING THE OUTSIDE LEGAL EXPENSES WOULD HAVE ON THE FINANCIAL INTEGRITY OF WOWSC.

A.

lf the Commission adopts Staff's recommended water and wastewater base rates, WOWSC will not generate sufficient revenue to recover Staff's "adjusted" 2019 revenue requirement. The recommended base rates recover approximately \$49,000 less when one includes WOWSC's gallonage fees and 2019 usage. As discussed in the Rebuttal Testimony of Grant Rabon, Staff significantly overestimates WOWSC's variable revenue from water sold and wastewater treated. WOWSC's 2019 water gallonage revenue is estimated at \$73,811 and wastewater gallonage revenue is estimated at \$33,195 for a total of \$107,006⁴ which is, \$49,000 short, of Staff's gallonage revenue of \$155,944.⁵ Additionally, the significantly reduced revenue would severely impact WOWSC's ability to: a) maintain binding loan covenants; b) make required repairs and improvements to aging equipment, such as the clarifier and water tank; c) react to and mitigate environmental challenges (zebra mussels, dispersant fields); d) retain current legal counsel

⁴ See Windermere Oaks Water Supply Corporation's 2019 Water Sewer Revenue Model (provided as Attachment MN-6).

⁵ See Direct Testimony of Stephen Mendoza, Attachment SJM-3 at 2 (May 5, 2021) (Mendoza Direct).

and/or to find subsequent legal counsel, putting the organization at risk of additional legal action brought by the same small group of members.

3 Q. DOES WOWSC HAVE ACCESS TO EXCESS FUNDS TO USE FOR LEGAL

4 EXPENSES?

A. No. As discussed in the rebuttal testimony of Joe Gimenez, WOWSC has three promissory notes with CoBank. However, each of those three promissory notes are predicated on use for explicit purposes: a) finance various capital expenditures; b) refinance indebtedness to First United Bank and Trust; and c) purchase a new clarifier/pre-treatment tank and UV treatment equipment. WOWSC must use these funds as expressly provided in the loan covenants and cannot pay for outside legal expenses with them.

11 Q. IF THE OUTSIDE LEGAL EXPENSES WERE ALLOWED, DO YOU AGREE 12 WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDED TIME-PERIOD FOR RECOVERY?

13 A. No, as explained further in the rebuttal testimonies of Joe Gimenez and Grant Rabon, these
14 outside legal expenses were primarily incurred over a two-year period. WOWSC should
15 be allowed to recover these amounts over a corresponding time period. The lawsuit styled
16 TOMA Integrity v. WOWSC,⁶ was filed December 12, 2017. WOWSC began incurring
17 legal defense invoices starting in 2018, not 2016.

18 Q. WHAT IMPACT WOULD A RECOVERY PERIOD OF LONGER THAN TWO 19 YEARS HAVE ON THE FINANCIAL INTEGRITY OF WOWSC?

A. Prolonging the recovery of these legal expense payments would severely impact
WOWSC's ability to retain current legal counsel and to find subsequent legal counsel to
defend itself from ongoing litigation and potential future legal challenges. Furthermore, a

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY 6 MIKE NELSON

⁶ TOMA Integrity v. Windermere Oaks Water Supply Corporation, No. 47531 (33rd Dist. Ct., Burnet County, Tex., Dec. 12, 2017) (TOMA Lawsuit).

small group of members have initiated litigation against WOWSC three times in the courts since the end of 2017 and have shown no signs of stopping. Thus, it is likely that WOWSC will incur additional legal costs related to litigation in the future.

4 Q. WHAT IS STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING WOWSC'S 5 RECOVERY OF RATE CASE EXPENSES?

6 A. Staff witness Maxine Gilford recommends the Commission allow recovery of rate-case expenses in the amount of \$148,747.12.8

Ms. Gilford further recommends that if WOWSC is permitted to impose a surcharge, that it recover its rate-case expenses through a monthly surcharge to all of its customers over a five-year period. Ms. Gilford recommends that the monthly amount equal the total rate-case expenses divided by the current number of connections, divided by five years, divided by 12 months and that the Commission limit recovery to the earlier of 60 months or such time that WOWSC recovers the full amount of allowed rate-case expenses. For the expenses incurred through February 28, 2021, the monthly surcharge per water connection and per wastewater connection equals \$4.80 (\$148,747.12 divided by [the sum of 271 water accounts and 245 wastewater accounts] divided by 60 months).

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS RECOMMENDATION?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

⁷ See TOMA Lawsuit; see also Rene Ffrench, John Richard Dial, Stuart Bruce Sorgen, and as Representatives for Windermere Oaks Water Supply Corporation v. Friendship Homes & Hangars, LLC, WOWSC, and its Directors William Earnest, Thomas Michael Madden, Dana Martin; Robert Mebane; and Patrick Mulligan (originally styled Double F Hanger Operations, LLC, Lawrence R. Ffrench, Jr., Patricia Flunker, and Mark A. McDonald v Friendship Homes & Hangars, LLC, and Burnet County Commissioners Court), No. 48292 (33rd Dist. Ct., Burnet County, Tex. Jul. 9, 2018) (Double F Hanger Lawsuit); and the case at issue in this proceeding (Docket No. 50788).

⁸ Gilford Direct at 18:2-3.

⁹ Gilford Direct at 18:6-14.

A. No. As with the legal expenses, prolonging the recovery of rate-case expenses would severely impact WOWSC's ability to retain current legal counsel and to find subsequent legal counsel, thus putting the organization at risk from additional litigation. A small group of members have initiated litigation against WOWSC three times in the courts (*Double F Hanger* Lawsuit, *TOMA* Lawsuit, and this suit at issue) since the end of 2017 and have shown no signs of stopping. Thus, WOWSC needs to recover funding for rate case expenses related to defense of this rate appeal in order to retain legal counsel in the event of future litigation initiated by WOWSC members.

A.

IV. RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF SPENCER ENGLISH

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. ENGLISH'S ASSESSMENT OF WOWSC'S TOTAL DEBT SERVICE?

No. For current debt service, Mr. English cites to Direct Testimony of Mike Nelson, Attachment MN-1 at Sheet 3, to determine that WOWSC's total debt service for 2019 was \$532,283. This is incorrect. In the Direct Testimony of Mike Nelson, Attachment MN-1 at Sheet 3 is titled "WOWSC's Current Rates—effective March 23, 2020" and does not include the figure \$532,283 or any information regarding WOWSC's loan.

I believe Mr. English is referring to the native file found on the Commission interchange where Attachment MN-1 is the Texas Rural Water Association (TRWA) Rate Analysis. The TRWA Rate Analysis is found at hard copy Attachment MN-2 in the Direct Testimony of Mike Nelson, and does not include Sheets 2 or 3.

The number "\$532,283" is found on Sheet 3 of the native TRWA Rate Analysis. However, that sheet is unrelated to WOWSC's rate analysis and was inadvertently included in the native file. Indeed, the title of Sheet 3 is "1999 Water Revenue Requirement & Rate

Direct Testimony of Spencer English at 2:15, and at 4 fn. 1 (May 5, 2021) (Spencer Direct).

- Design" and is for "Utility: Mauriceville SUD." To correct the record, in 2019 WOWSC
- 2 had one outstanding loan with First United Bank and WOWSC made twelve monthly
- principal and interest payments of \$4,157.71 which totals to \$49,892.52.

4 Q. WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THIS ERROR ON MR. ENGLISH'S 5 RECOMMENDATION?

- 6 A. It is not exactly clear, as I cannot locate where Mr. English uses "\$532,283" in his analysis.
- 7 I also cannot locate in Attachment MN-1 Sheet 1 where WOWSC's rates reflect a debt
- 8 service coverage ratio of 1.0x as Mr. English testifies. 11 As discussed in the financial
- 9 assessment prepared by Grant Rabon in September 2020, WOWSC's debt service coverage
- ratio for 2019 was 1.1x. 12 There is a slight discrepancy between the number for debt service
- used by Mr. Rabon and the number included in the testimony above, but the 1.1x debt
- service coverage as included in Mr. Rabon's assessment is still accurate.

13 V. RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN J. MENDOZA

- 14 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE MR. MENDOZA'S RECOMMENDED ADJUSTMENT TO

 15 WOWSC'S MONTHLY BASE RATES. 13
- 16 A. Mr. Mendoza recommends a monthly base water rate of \$45.92 and wastewater rate of
- \$33.87. This recommendation would reduce WOWSC's monthly base rates of \$90.39 for
- water and \$66.41 for wastewater to amounts lower than the existing base rates prior to the
- 19 2020 rate increase that is the subject of this appeal (which were \$50.95 and \$40.12 for
- water and wastewater, respectively).¹⁴

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY 9 MIKE NELSON

¹¹ Mendoza Direct at 3:17.

¹² See Direct Testimony of Joe Gimenez, Attachment JG-6 at 2 (Mar. 10, 2021) (Gimenez Direct).

¹³ Mendoza Direct at 4:20-5:2.

Mendoza Direct at 5:12-18.

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS RECOMMENDATION?

A. No. Not only would Mr. Mendoza's recommendation put WOWSC in a financial situation worse than when it decided it was necessary to implement a rate increase, it would also not even appear to allow WOWSC to recover Staff's recommended total revenue requirement of \$404,855 with WOWSC's gallonage fees and 2019 usage. As detailed further in the rebuttal testimony of Grant Rabon, Mr. Mendoza's monthly base rates would fall substantially short, of generating the adjusted revenue requirement. Despite the significant discrepancy, Staff has not explained how WOWSC would account for or otherwise cover the difference in amounts. The WOWSC Board used the TRWA analysis to understand the maximum increases that could be made to the base rates based on the 2019 financials. The TRWA analysis determined WOWSC's 2019 expenses justified maximum base rates totaling \$174.59, ¹⁵ and the Board stayed well below that maximum value with base rates totaling \$156.80 (\$90.39 + \$66.41).

VI. RESPONSE TO INITIAL TESTIMONY OF PATTI FLUNKER

- 15 Q. REFERRING TO PATTI FLUNKER'S TESTIMONY,¹⁶ HAS MS. FLUNKER
 16 RECOMMENDED THE ASSISTANCE OF TRWA ON OCCASIONS OTHER
 17 THAN FOR A WASTEWATER CIRCUIT RIDER?
- 18 A. Yes, that is not the only time Ms. Flunker recommended assistance from TRWA. In fact,
 19 Ms. Flunker has mentioned and recommended the use of TRWA on several occasions,
 20 including more recently.

¹⁵ See Direct Testimony of Mike Nelson, Attachment MN-2 at cell K56.

¹⁶ Direct Testimony of Patti Flunker at 5:6-8 (Apr. 7, 2021) (P. Flunker Direct).

- 1 Q. PATTI FLUNKER CLAIMS THAT ADDITIONAL FORMULAS WERE USED TO
- 2 **DETERMINE THE EFFECTIVE RATE.** 17 **DO YOU AGREE?**
- 3 A. No, it is my understanding that no additional formulas were used.
- 4 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN MS. FLUNKER'S THEORY THAT THE NUMBER OF
- 5 GALLONS TREATED WAS NOT INCORPORATED INTO THE
- 6 **WATER/WASTEWATER STUDY.** 18
- 7 A. Gallonage charges are included in TRWA's analysis. To share the increased legal expenses
- 8 burden across all members, WOWSC's Board decided to only adjust base rates and to not
- 9 change gallonage rates. The new monthly base rates of \$90.39 for water and \$66.41 for
- wastewater total \$156.80, which was less than the base rates total of \$174.59 in TRWA's
- analysis. This enabled the Board to move forward with base rates only changes. The base
- rates changes were calculated to pay an additional $$65.73 \times 253 = $16,629.69$ per month
- towards legal balances. The base rates were not changed to the maximum determined by
- the TRWA analysis.
- 15 VII. CONCLUSION
- 16 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
- 17 A. Yes, it does.

P. Flunker Direct at 8:8-11.

¹⁸ P. Flunker Direct at 9:4-5.

Y2019 WOWSC Water and Waste-Water Revenue Model Based on Y2019 Gallonage

			Accounts	Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts	Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts	Gallonage
			January	January	January	February	February	February	March	March
		WWTP gallons		140,700			125,400			119,100
		Process Meter		26,200			23,300			19,100
		Water Leaks and Flush					300,000			
				166,900			448,700			138,200
Water Service Rates										
Base charge	\$50.95	per meter								
0 gallons			52	0		56	0		51	0
0 - 2000 gallons	3.55	per 1000 gallons	107	96600	\$342.93	111	93000	\$330.15	114	89500
2001 - 4000 gallons	6.50	per 1000 gallons	63	184300	\$826.25	67	200900	\$910.55	64	182900
4001 - 8000 gallons	9.75	per 1000 gallons	40	216400	\$1,353.90	29	153300	\$946.58	30	155700
8001 - 10000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	3	28100	\$152.60	3	25400	\$117.50	3	27400
10001 - 15000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	0	31,800	\$413.40	1	10,300	\$89.00	5	99,900
15001 or more	15.00	per 1000 gallons	4	307,200	\$4,228.00	1	31,400	\$396.10	1	40,900
		Gallonage Total	269	864,400	\$7,317.08	268	514,300	\$2,789.88	268	596,300
Sewer Service Rates			<u> </u>							
Base Charge	\$40.12	per meter	239			239			238	
1 - 10000 gallons	\$3.94	per 1000 gallons		565400	\$2,227.68		492600	\$1,940.84		515500

			Revenue	Accounts	Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts	Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts
			March	April	April	April	May	May	May	June
		WWTP gallons			127,200			166,900		-
		Process Meter			20,800			22,800		
		Water Leaks and Flush						16,000		
					148,000			205,700		
Water Service Rates										
Base charge	\$50.95	per meter								
0 gallons				51	0		49	0		44
0 - 2000 gallons	3.55	per 1000 gallons	\$317.73	110	91800	\$325.89	101	81500	\$289.33	102
2001 - 4000 gallons	6.50	per 1000 gallons	\$811.25	60	187000	\$861.50	61	172600	\$762.00	64
4001 - 8000 gallons	9.75	per 1000 gallons	\$951.08	37	204000	\$1,289.70	44	234300	\$1,452.83	36
8001 - 10000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	\$143.50	5	44200	\$220.10	6	52300	\$254.50	
10001 - 15000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	\$1,074.20	3	100,400	\$1,170.50	3	87,100	\$997.60	18
15001 or more	15.00	per 1000 gallons	\$619.00	5	41,700	\$210.80	9	96,200	\$648.30	7
		Gallonage Total	\$3,916.75	271	669,100	\$4,078.49	273	724,000	\$4,404.55	271
Sewer Service Rates										
Base Charge	\$40.12	per meter		241			240			242
1 - 10000 gallons	\$3.94	per 1000 gallons	\$2,031.07	'	607000	\$2,391.58		660700	\$2,603.16	

			To-11	<u> </u>		[C-11	D		G-11	D
			Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Accounts		Revenue
			June	June	July	July	July	August	August	August
		WWTP gallons	187,000			197,100			193,100	
		Process Meter	22,000			20800			21,100	
		Water Leaks and Flush	16,000			275000			***	
			225,000			492,900			214,200	
Water Service Rates										
Base charge	\$50.95	per meter								
0 gallons			0		41	0		42	0	
0 - 2000 gallons	3.55	per 1000 gallons	82900	\$294.30	86	62400	\$221.52	73	52800	\$187.44
2001 - 4000 gallons	6.50	per 1000 gallons	193100	\$877.55	63	181500	\$808.05	55	159700	\$713.55
4001 - 8000 gallons	9.75	per 1000 gallons	195700	\$1,227.68	53	294400	\$1,868.70	55	334750	\$2,224.31
8001 - 10000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons		\$0.00	19	195100	\$1,189.20	11	100300	\$524.00
10001 - 15000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	193,000	\$1,700.80		0	\$0.00	15	391,500	\$4,416.00
15001 or more	15.00	per 1000 gallons	109,100	\$1,333.30	12	246,900	\$2,563.50	15	150,300	\$1,131.00
		Gallonage Total	773,800	\$5,433.62	274	980,300	\$6,650.97	266	1,189,350	\$9,196.30
Sewer Service Rates										
Base Charge	\$40.12	per meter			241			243		
1 - 10000 gallons	\$3.94	per 1000 gallons	721700	\$2,843.50		853400	\$3,362.40		947550	\$3,733.35

			Accounts	Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts	Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts
			September	September	September	October	October	October	November
		WWTP gallons		208,700			175,900		
		Process Meter		11,000					
		Water Leaks and Flush							
				219,700			175,900		
Water Service Rates									
Base charge	\$50.95	per meter							
0 gallons			42	0		48	0		49
0 - 2000 gallons	3.55	per 1000 gallons	92	75040	\$266.39	102	80100	\$284.36	104
2001 - 4000 gallons	6.50	per 1000 gallons	37	114500	\$525.95	57	167800	\$754.40	75
4001 - 8000 gallons	9.75	per 1000 gallons	50	281500	\$1,799.63	51	289200	\$1,855.80	41
8001 - 10000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	8	72300	\$372.70	9	81600	\$422.70	4
10001 - 15000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	20	253,900	\$2,402.70	11	149,600	\$1,450.90	5
15001 or more	15.00	per 1000 gallons	29	669,700	\$7,692.50	6	142,200	\$1,784.10	4
		Gallonage Total	278	1,466,940	\$13,059.87	284	910,500	\$6,552.26	282
Sewer Service Rates									
Base Charge	\$40.12	per meter	245			249			246
1 - 10000 gallons	\$3.94	per 1000 gallons		1033340	\$4,071.36		788700	\$3,107.48	

			Gallonage	Revenue	Accounts	Gallonage	Revenue	<u> </u>	Y2019
			November	November	December	December	December		Totals
		WWTP gallons	130,200			129,000			1,900,300
		Process Meter							187,100
		Water Leaks and Flush							607,000
			130,200			129,000			
Water Service Rates								Accounts	Gallonage
Base charge	\$50.95	per meter	-					Totals	Totals
0 gallons			0		52	0		577	0
0 - 2000 gallons	3.55	per 1000 gallons	83400	\$296.07	104	94500	\$335.48	1206	983540
2001 - 4000 gallons	6.50	per 1000 gallons	209700	\$920.55	62	184600	\$834.10	728	2138600
4001 - 8000 gallons	9.75	per 1000 gallons	213000	\$1,301.85	43	223400	\$1,365.45	509	2795650
8001 - 10000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	37400	\$202.60	5	43200	\$207.10	76	707300
10001 - 15000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	59,200	\$545.10	1	20,500	\$221.60	82	1,397,200
15001 or more	15.00	per 1000 gallons	173,200	\$2,318.50	5	154,500	\$1,862.60	98	2,163,300
		Gallonage Total	775,900	\$5,584.67	272	720,700	\$4,826.33	3,276	10,185,590
Sewer Service Rates		p				· ····			
Base Charge	\$40.12	per meter			245			2908	sum
1 - 10000 gallons	\$3.94	per 1000 gallons	633500	\$2,495.99		605700	\$2,386.46		8,425,090

			1
		WWTP gallons	
		Process Meter	
		Water Leaks and Flush	
Water Service Rates			Revenue
Base charge	\$50.95	per meter	Totals
0 gallons			Y2019
0 - 2000 gallons	3.55	per 1000 gallons	\$3,491.57
2001 - 4000 gallons	6.50	per 1000 gallons	\$9,605.70
4001 - 8000 gallons	9.75	per 1000 gallons	\$17,637.49
8001 - 10000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	\$3,806.50
10001 - 15000 gallons	13.00	per 1000 gallons	\$14,481.80
15001 or more	15.00	per 1000 gallons	\$24,787.70
	-	Gallonage Total	\$73,810.75
Sewer Service Rates			
Base Charge	\$40.12	per meter	sum
1 - 10000 gallons	\$3.94	per 1000 gallons	\$33,194.85

273 Average number of water accounts

242 Average number of waste-water accounts

\$166,912.20 water base rate revenue

\$73,810.75 water gallonage revenue

\$116,668.96 waste-water base rate revenue

\$33,194.85 waste-water gallonage revenue

\$390,586.77 Total Projected Revenue Y2019 Water + Waste-Water Services

\$369,541.10 Actual Y2019 Water & Sewer Services Revenue

94.6% Model over projected revenue by 5.4%

\$107,005.61 Water + Waste-Water Gallonage Projected Revenue Y2019